DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17753397

Version: Master v3 (2025-11)

Grid Management via Geometry

A 2025 Framework for Phase-Coherent, Low-Entropy Grid Operation

Michael K. Nowlin

Independent Engineering & Grid Efficiency Research

This paper is released freely for public use. No permission required.

Abstract

Three-phase power systems are geometric machines whose stability and efficiency are determined by the preservation of phase symmetry, not by voltage magnitude alone. Modern grid operation fragments this geometry: uncoordinated switching, asynchronous control loops, and ad hoc grounding create avoidable asymmetry expressed as zero-, negative-, and distortion-sequence currents. These components increase losses, elevate transformer hot-spot temperatures, reduce inverter hosting capacity, and degrade protection coordination across existing 2025 transmission and distribution assets.

This paper develops a geometry-based operational framework that reduces system entropy using only configuration and control changes. Two independent but mutually reinforcing methods are formalized. First, phase-coherent switching constrains tap-changer, inverter, and drive actions to shared angle windows, characterized by an energy-loss relationship

$$E_{loss} = k \cdot |\sin(\Delta\theta / 2)|$$

where $\Delta\theta$ is the deviation from ideal 120° symmetry at the instant of action. Second, grounding-geometry optimization treats neutral and earth paths as a designed impedance network capable of steering zero-sequence current, with $I0 = (Ia + Ib + Ic) / 3$ and $V0 = I0 \cdot Z0$ used as primary diagnostic quantities. Together, these methods are evaluated using a composite asymmetry metric

$$\Delta_{asym} = \sqrt{I0^2 + I1^2 + I2^2}.$$

Figure 1 conceptually illustrates this relationship: symmetry points at 0°, 120°, and 240° lie at the zeros of the sine curve, while misaligned switching events between these points ride up the $|\sin(\Delta\theta/2)|$ envelope and generate geometric loss.

In practical terms, when $\Delta\theta = 0°$ the event is perfectly aligned and $E_{loss} = 0$. As $\Delta\theta$ grows toward midpoints between symmetry nodes, a larger fraction of the event's energy is forced into negative- and zero-sequence components instead of useful work.

This form arises directly from standard phasor geometry. For two unit phasors at angles α and β, the magnitude of their difference is $|e^{j\alpha} - e^{j\beta}| = 2 \cdot |\sin((\alpha - \beta)/2)|$. A misaligned switching vector can be viewed as a deviation from its nearest symmetry vector; the resulting disturbance magnitude is therefore proportional to $|\sin(\Delta\theta/2)|$, which justifies using $E_{loss} = k \cdot |\sin(\Delta\theta/2)|$ as the central geometric loss law.

• $\Delta\theta$ is the angular misalignment between the switching event and the nearest three-phase symmetry point (0°, 120°, or 240°).

• k is a proportionality constant that depends on local impedance, the magnitude of the switching event, and instantaneous power level.

• E_{loss} is the incremental energy driven into asymmetry (loss, heating, flicker, harmonic spread), rather than useful work.

Where:

Analytical modeling and representative substation–feeder case studies indicate that coordinated phase windows can substantially reduce negative-sequence current I2, while targeted grounding adjustments can materially lower zero-sequence current I0. In example scenarios examined by the author, combined reductions in the composite asymmetry metric Δ_asym on the order of tens of percent lead to single-digit percentage decreases in I^2R losses and several degrees Celsius of transformer hot-spot relief, along with measurable increases in DER hosting capacity, all without new primary hardware. Additional behavior-based measures—such as stepped, phase-aligned VFD operation and synchronized large-motor scheduling—further extend equipment life and reduce unplanned outages.

The framework is vendor-neutral and intentionally open: any utility, ISO, or large end-user can implement, test, and extend these methods using measurement and control infrastructure already deployed. The central claim is practical and falsifiable: a three-phase grid operated with explicit geometric discipline is more stable, more efficient, and less capital-intensive than the same grid operated without it.

I. Introduction & Problem Statement

By 2025, the electrical grid no longer fails for lack of intelligence, instrumentation, or computational capability. It fails because its operational worldview has become misaligned with the physical system it must govern. Transmission and distribution assets behave exactly as built; entropy arises from management assumptions, not from physics.

For more than three decades, utilities, OEMs, and large users have solved local problems with local fixes: a relay tweak here, a VAR device there, an inverter firmware update, a new tariff. Each change was rational in isolation. In aggregate, these changes have produced a macro-system that is difficult to predict, expensive to operate, and increasingly fragile.

The conventional response to instability has been a renewed search for causes: new reports, new fault trees, new root-cause narratives. The result is a growing archive of explanations with limited impact on overall behavior. The grid continues to operate exactly as it has been instructed—fragmented, reactive, and geometry-blind.

This paper adopts a different starting point. It does not propose a new grid, nor does it attempt to relitigate the past. It introduces a process-management framework for the existing 2025 grid based on a single principle: all stability in a three-phase system comes from symmetry; all loss comes from entropy. Instead of asking the system to do more, we ask it to operate in closer alignment with the geometry it was built upon.

II. The Governing Geometry of Three-Phase Stability

Three-phase power systems are not merely collections of voltages, currents, and impedances. They are geometric machines whose behavior is determined by phase relationships—particularly the 120° separation between phases and the 60° and 30° submultiples that define natural harmonic windows.

From a geometric perspective, a three-phase system can be described by a symmetry triad:

- Physical symmetry: conductor layout, transformer connections, and grounding topology.
- Electrical symmetry: phase angle separation, sequence component balance, and harmonic content.
- Operational symmetry: how and when switching, dispatch, and load changes occur in time.

Deviations from symmetry can be summarized using sequence components. Let I1, I2, and I0 denote positive-, negative-, and zero-sequence currents respectively. A composite asymmetry measure can be defined as:

$$\Delta_asym = \sqrt{I0^2 + I1^2 + I2^2}$$

which aggregates imbalance into a single scalar quantity. While other normalizations are possible, the key point is that increases in I0 and I2 represent departures from geometric balance and correlate directly with losses, heating, and protection stress.

The corrective action is expressed as a geometric adjustment rather than a purely numerical one. If $\Delta\theta$ represents the angular deviation from ideal symmetry at a node or during a switching event, then a corrective angle $\Delta\varphi$ must be applied by control logic, topology choice, or scheduling to restore symmetry. In practice, this means recognizing the special role of the 60° separation and the 30° midpoint as preferred alignment points for switching, grounding, and large load transitions.

The remainder of this paper builds on this geometric viewpoint: instead of treating voltage and current as independent control targets, we treat phase geometry as the governing variable and show that many observed problems disappear when geometry is managed explicitly.

III. The Three Geometric Errors of the 2025 Grid

The 2025 grid does not fail because it is old, complex, or under-funded. It fails because its geometry is mismanaged. System-level instability can be traced, again and again, to three recurring geometric errors.

1. Timing Without Geometry
Modern switching fleets—VFDs, inverters, STATCOMs, UPS systems, BESS controllers—inject phase-breaking events at arbitrary times, driven by local control loops rather than system-wide geometric awareness. These asynchronous actions accumulate as negative-sequence current, zero-sequence leakage, harmonic clusters, and transformer heating. The behavior is not random; it is the expected result of ignoring phase alignment.

2. Grounding Without Intent
Grounding is frequently treated as a safety reference or a fault sink, rather than as an engineered impedance network. Neutral bonds are placed for convenience, Δ–Y banks are selected without explicit zero-sequence intent, and incremental projects create parallel ground paths. The net effect is an uncontrolled fourth phase that carries circulating currents and contributes to neutral drift.

3. Load Coordination Without Symmetry
The original grid was built for synchronous generation feeding largely linear loads. The 2025 grid is non-synchronous generation feeding non-linear loads, but is still operated with heuristics from the synchronous era. Loads and generators are dispatched independently, with little attention to the symmetry of the aggregate waveform. As a result, the grid rarely forms the coherent three-phase shape it was designed to produce.

These are not hardware problems. They are geometric problems. The equipment is performing as installed and specified. The losses, heating, and instability arise from the absence of system-level geometric discipline. The remainder of the paper addresses that gap.

IV. Phase-Aligned Timing: The Governing Equation and Its Meaning

If Section III identifies the geometric errors, Section IV introduces the core quantitative relationship governing energy loss due to misaligned switching events.

Consider a switching action—such as a tap change, an inverter injection, or a VFD step—occurring at an angle $\Delta\theta$ away from the ideal three-phase symmetry condition. The incremental energy that is driven into asymmetry rather than useful work can be modeled as:

$$E_{loss} = k \cdot |\sin(\Delta\theta / 2)|$$

where k is a proportionality constant depending on system impedance, device characteristics, and instantaneous power level.

This simple form has powerful implications:

- When $\Delta\theta = 0°$, $E_{loss} = 0$: a perfectly aligned event injects no geometric entropy.
- When $\Delta\theta \approx 30°$, $E_{loss} \approx 0.26k$: roughly one quarter of the event's energy contributes to asymmetry.
- When $\Delta\theta = 60°$, $E_{loss} = 0.5k$: half of the event's energy appears as destabilizing noise.

In modern networks, thousands of such events occur every second without reference to common phase windows. From the perspective of the three-phase machine, the grid is being excited off-axis repeatedly and unnecessarily.

The corrective principle is straightforward: constrain major switching actions to a small set of shared geometric windows—for example 0°, 30°, 60°, and 120° relative to a system phase reference established from PMU or equivalent measurements. Control systems do not need to act continuously; they need to act coherently.

This does not require new primary equipment. It requires firmware and control logic that delay non-urgent actions by microseconds until a geometric window opens. In doing so, the grid moves from a regime of continuous, uncoordinated corrections to one of intermittent, aligned corrections that respect the underlying three-phase geometry.

V. Grounding Geometry: The Hidden Variable That Controls Everything

While phase alignment governs when energy is exchanged, grounding geometry governs where imbalance energy flows when the system is disturbed. Ground and neutral form an effective fourth phase: they define zero-sequence paths, neutral-to-earth voltage, and the distribution of harmonic currents.

Zero-sequence current is defined as:

$$I0 = (Ia + Ib + Ic) / 3$$

In a perfectly symmetric system with an ideal reference, I0 is negligible. In real networks, persistent I0 and the associated zero-sequence voltage $V0 = I0 \cdot Z0$ are indicators of grounding geometry rather than random noise.

Common grounding errors in 2025 include:

- Neutral bonds sited for construction convenience rather than impedance control.
- Δ–Y transformer banks deployed without explicit decisions about trapping or passing zero-sequence components.
- Ground loops created by incremental projects that inadvertently establish parallel return paths.

To correct these issues, grounding must be reframed as a spatial network with designed impedance rather than a set of isolated points. Key steps include:

- Modeling major ground and neutral connections as a graph, with nodes representing substations, large customers, and DER tie points.
- Calculating effective zero-sequence impedances for critical paths and identifying unintended low-impedance routes.
- Deliberately designating a limited number of primary neutral reference locations and reducing competing bonds.
- Using Δ–Y interfaces as steering elements for zero-sequence behavior.
- Time-aligning grounding events, such as ground-switch operations and NGR insertions, with stable phase positions (e.g., 0° or 180°).

Field and modeled experience indicate that modest adjustments in grounding geometry can produce substantial reductions in I0 and neutral-to-earth voltage excursions, and significantly reduce unexplained transformer heating and nuisance protection trips. In representative modeled and industrial cases, reductions on the order of tens of percent in these quantities are achievable, but actual values are system-specific and should be established through pilot studies. These improvements feed directly into the composite asymmetry measure and reinforce the benefits of phase-aligned timing described earlier.

Grounding, treated as geometry, becomes a primary tool for managing asymmetry rather than a static background condition. When combined with phase-coherent control, it forms the second pillar of a low-entropy, high-stability grid.

These results do not claim to be exhaustive or fleet-averaged. They are offered as concrete, falsifiable examples demonstrating that the geometric framework of this paper is compatible with standard power system tools and yields the types of improvements qualitatively described in the Introduction and Abstract. Utilities and industrial users can readily reproduce and refine these studies in their own systems using the methods outlined here.

• When major control actions are phase-coherent, the composite asymmetry metric Δ_asym decreases, with corresponding reductions in I^2R losses and transformer thermal stress.
• When grounding is treated as a designed geometric network rather than a collection of safety references, zero-sequence currents and neutral-to-earth voltages decrease meaningfully.
• When end-use behavior—particularly VFD and large motor operation—is aligned with geometric timing windows, both the grid and the customer facility experience fewer disturbances and lower entropy.

Across these representative studies, the pattern is consistent:

E. Summary of Evidence

In representative industrial cases, the combination of stepped ramps and timing windows produced modest but real percentage improvements in feeder losses and equipment thermal life, consistent with other targeted efficiency programs. More importantly, it significantly improved the predictability and stability of local power quality.

Under stepped, phase-aware ramping, motors instead used a small number of discrete speed steps with brief dwell times. Step transitions were aligned, within process constraints, to a utility-provided phase window timetable. Modeled and measured outcomes at the point of common coupling included reduced peak instantaneous inrush current during batch operations, a narrower harmonic signature with lower amplitudes at problematic frequencies, and an observable reduction in negative-sequence currents and nuisance trips in nearby sensitive equipment.

Under continuous ramping, motors used smooth linear ramps driven by local PID loops, with start times uncorrelated between drives and uncoordinated with feeder-level phase windows. The resulting impacts on the local feeder included broad harmonic injections during acceleration periods, overlapping inrush effects, elevated negative-sequence currents, and recurrent small voltage dips.

To connect the geometric framework to end-use behavior, an industrial facility with several large VFD-driven motors (400–800 HP range) was analyzed under two control patterns.

D. Industrial VFD Stepping and Behavioral Alignment

In an inherited grounding configuration with multiple neutral–earth bonds and no explicit zero-sequence steering, modeled results at a key substation showed elevated I0 and

neutral-to-earth voltage excursions, along with unexplained transformer heating and occasional protection mis-operations. After deliberately designating a reduced set of primary neutral reference points and using selected Δ–Y banks to steer zero-sequence components, the same substation exhibited substantial reductions in I0 and neutral-to-earth voltage. In representative modeled cases, reductions on the order of tens of percent in these quantities were observed, with corresponding improvements in transformer thermal margins.

A second study examined a 34.5 kV subtransmission loop feeding multiple 12.47 kV distribution substations with mixed Δ–Y and Y–Y transformer banks. Over time, incremental projects had produced parallel neutral and ground paths that were never designed as a coordinated zero-sequence network.

C. Grounding Geometry Adjustment Scenario

2. Phase-aligned operation: the same events are delayed into shared phase windows (for example, at 0°, 30°, 60° relative to a reference phase). Under identical loading, negative-sequence and zero-sequence currents are reduced substantially, and Δ_asym decreases by a tangible amount. In representative modeled cases, reductions in I2 and I0 on the order of tens of percent translate into single-digit percentage reductions in total I^2R losses and several degrees Celsius of transformer hot-spot relief, consistent with the qualitative claims in the Abstract.

1. Baseline operation: tap-changer actions, capacitor bank switching, and large VFD setpoint changes occur when requested by local controllers, with no phase-window coordination. Sequence currents at the substation bus show elevated negative- and zero-sequence components and a composite asymmetry Δ_asym slightly above 1.0 p.u., with normalized copper loss set to 1.00 p.u.

A representative 12.47 kV radial feeder with a 10 MVA substation transformer and a mix of industrial and commercial loads was modeled under two operating modes:

B. Substation–Feeder Phase-Alignment Scenario

Transformers are evaluated with a per-unit loss baseline and a first-order link between incremental loss and hot-spot temperature rise. Copper loss is proportional to I^2, and a conservative rule-of-thumb slope of 1–2 °C per 1% increase in total loss is used for illustration; actual values are transformer-specific.

• Load flow and short-circuit calculations using positive-, negative-, and zero-sequence networks.
• Harmonic analysis with injected current spectra for VFDs and inverters.
• Sequence component extraction to obtain I0, I1, I2 and the composite asymmetry metric $\Delta_asym = \sqrt{I0^2 + I1^2 + I2^2}$.
• A simple energy-loss relationship for misaligned switching events: $E_loss = k \cdot |\sin(\Delta\theta/2)|$, where $\Delta\theta$ is the angular deviation from the nearest symmetry point.

All examples in this section are based on standard three-phase power system tools:

A. Modeling Approach and Metrics

This section summarizes representative analytical and case-study style results that motivated the geometric framework presented in Sections II–V. The intent is not to claim fleet-wide statistics, but to show how phase-coherent timing and grounding-geometry adjustments translate into measurable changes in the asymmetry metric Δ_asym, losses, and transformer thermal behavior in realistic systems.

VI. Representative Modeling and Case Study Results

VII. Behavioral Alignment and Grid Partnership

Technical improvements alone cannot deliver the next order of grid efficiency. Every operator already knows this, but the industry rarely says it plainly:

Supply and demand must behave in synchrony, or both sides pay for the entropy.

Traditional controls—linear PID loops, continuous VFD ramps, fixed schedules, and one-directional SCADA polling—were never designed for macro-harmonic operation. They respond locally, not relationally. The result is the same failure pattern repeating across the 2025 grid: a system that performs correctly in isolated segments but misaligns when viewed as a whole.

To shift the system from "correct but incoherent" to "stable and harmonic," the behavioral layer must be addressed alongside the geometric and phase-control layers.

A. Behavior-Based Savings: A Known but Underused Leverage Point
In industrial engineering, the most durable energy reductions did not come from hardware upgrades. They came from what we called behavior-based savings—operator scheduling, sequencing discipline, and pattern alignment that allowed existing assets to work in phase with one another.

The same principle applies to the grid.

When customers adopt stepped VFD acceleration rather than linear ramps—particularly when those steps align to known feeder windows—losses drop immediately:
- reduced transformer heating
- reduced harmonic scatter
- reduced reactive oscillations
- extended motor and drive life
- fewer nuisance trips and protection events

These outcomes are not speculative; they are observed truths in industrial environments

that have standardized sequencing and stepping. Utilities cannot mandate internal facility behavior, but they can enable and invite it by broadcasting stable timing windows and phase-aligned coordination signals.

B. Mutual Visibility Produces Mutual Stability

As soon as the grid exposes its macro-harmonic rhythm to users—via stepped windows, geometric dispatch intervals, or phase-space timing—the relationship changes:

- Supply no longer chases demand.
- Demand no longer shocks supply.
- Both sides synchronize around a shared geometric cadence.

In modeling and field experience, this produces:

- noticeable reductions in instantaneous inrush penalties on distribution lines
- measurable reductions in copper losses
- significant reductions in customer-side motor heating
- measurable improvement in localized frequency holding when VFD behavior is stepped, not continuous

In representative industrial cases, these effects have appeared at modest percentage scales consistent with other efficiency-improvement programs, but precise values are installation-dependent and should be confirmed through local measurement.

C. A Grid That Learns From Its Users

As customers align behavior with geometric windows, the grid becomes more predictable: harmonic profiles flatten, feeder imbalances reduce, transformer thermal curves smooth, and protection systems operate less frequently and more cleanly. In other words, every new aligned facility improves system-level stability for all facilities downstream of it. This is how the grid becomes self-fortifying without new hardware.

D. The Right Idea at the Right Moment

Utilities in 2025 face unprecedented constraints: aging T&D assets near thermal limits, renewable intermittency, EV load volatility, staffing shortages, and capital budgets that lag behind real need. The industry cannot afford another capex-forward strategy that promises results in 2032.

But it can afford geometry. Geometry is free. Behavior is free. Phase alignment is free.

The only cost is the mindset shift required to see the grid as a harmonic system rather than a reactive system. This paper provides the framework for that shift.

VIII. Implementation Path: A Geometric Roadmap for 2025–2030

Utilities in 2025 cannot afford multi-year reinvention cycles or capital-heavy "grid transformation programs." The opportunity presented in this paper is simpler: a geometric re-alignment of control, timing, grounding, and behavior that can be deployed incrementally, safely, and at negligible cost.

The implementation path that follows is not theoretical. It is specifically designed for the political, financial, and operational constraints utilities face today.

A. Phase 1 — Establish the Geometric Baseline (0–6 months)
Before any optimization is attempted, one action produces immediate clarity: define the fixed geometric windows of the feeder network. Every three-phase network has natural stability windows at 0° alignment, ±30°, and ±60°. These windows already exist in 2025; they are simply not used.

Mapping these windows requires no hardware change. It requires only feeder load snapshots, harmonic profiles, transformer phase-angle data, and VFD penetration surveys. The outcome of Phase 1 is a Geometric Timing Map, which becomes the shared language between supply-side operators and demand-side users.

B. Phase 2 — Phase-Aligned Control Logic (6–18 months)
Once the natural timing windows are known, the next step is to align switching and dispatch logic to them. This produces the first measurable stability and efficiency gains.

Actions include:
• Modifying VFD ramp profiles from linear PID to stepped transitions at 30° increments.
• Aligning capacitor bank switching to geometric windows instead of fixed time-of-day triggers.
• Updating SCADA polling intervals to reinforce (not disrupt) timing coherence.
• Phase-locking substation tap changes to reduce reactive scatter.

Expected results include a measurable reduction in feeder heating, a reduction in reactive power swing and associated voltage oscillations, an improvement in motor/VFD thermal life due to fewer off-angle events, and a measurable reduction in local flicker and voltage sag events. In modeled and early field scenarios, these tendencies have appeared at modest percentage scales consistent with other efficiency programs, but the exact magnitude will vary by system and should be quantified in utility-specific trials.

C. Phase 3 — Harmonic Grounding Strategy (12–24 months)
The grid's single largest invisible loss is grounding treated as a static reference instead of a dynamic stabilizer. A rigid ground forces instability; a harmonic ground absorbs it.

Utilities can begin with transformer-side harmonic filters, substation-level ground potential monitoring, and phase-angle adaptive grounding at large industrial loads. No new primary

hardware is required beyond existing power-quality tools; the difference is in how the measurements are coordinated.

D. Phase 4 — Demand-Side Participation Windows (18–36 months)
Once utilities publicly broadcast geometric timing windows—even on a coarse timescale—demand-side systems begin to self-align. Users will choose stepped VFD profiles because motors run cooler. They will choose synchronized startup windows because nuisance trips disappear. They will choose aligned batching because power bills drop.

This is partnership, not automation. The grid becomes a conductor. Facilities become instruments. The result is harmony at scale.

E. Phase 5 — Continuous Coherence Management (Year 3 onward)
By this point, utilities gain access to a new operational asset: predictable harmonic behavior. As alignment increases, forecasting improves, dispatch oscillations decrease, EV and renewable integration smooths, and outage probability declines. The grid begins to behave as it was always mathematically capable of behaving.

Conclusion: Leadership Is the Only Missing Variable
The techniques described in this paper require no revolutionary hardware, no political battles, and no long-term spending cycles. They require a new mindset, a geometric baseline, phase-coherent control logic, adaptive grounding, and demand-side partnership. Every utility in the world already possesses the assets needed to implement this.

This paper is free to use. No permission required. No intellectual ownership claimed. The future grid, if it exists at all, will be geometric.